

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 27, 2008. Claims 1 to 7, 19 and 20 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 19 and 20 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 7, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,047,955 (Shope) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0186384 (Winston) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,864,993 (Roberts). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 19 and 20 generally concern transmitting a document from a data processing apparatus to a printing device, wherein the document is formed by a plurality of logical pages, and printing pages for each of a plurality of sets. In particular, a plurality of logical pages for each of a plurality of sets is spooled, and one logical page, identical in drawing information to a first logical page from among the spooled plurality of logical pages, is retrieved. The one logical page is retrieved by discriminating a logical page corresponding to numerical factors of the plurality of logical pages. Drawing information from the first logical page to a logical page just previous to the one retrieved logical page is determined to be drawing information for one of the plurality of sets. A print command to be transmitted to a printing device based on the drawing information for the one determined set is generated and transmitted to the printing device.

Thus, the drawing information of the first logical page is compared with logical pages corresponding to numerical factors of the total number of logical pages in the document.

For example, if the number of logical pages in the document is 20, the numerical factors of the number 20 are 2, 4, 5, 10 and 20. As described above, the drawing information of the first logical is compared with the drawing information of those five logical pages (i.e., logical pages numbered 2, 4, 5, 10 and 20) corresponding to the numerical factors of the number 20. Thus, the claimed arrangement may retrieve the one logical page more efficiently, since the number of logical pages to be compared is reduced.

Applicant submits that the applied references, alone or in any permissible combination, are not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing arrangement, particularly the notion of retrieving, from among a plurality of spooled logical pages, one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page by discriminating a logical page corresponding to numerical factors of the plurality of logical pages.

Shope is seen to disclose storing rasterized signals of multi-page documents so that a plurality of electronically collated, multi-page sets can be printed without re-rasterization. Shope is seen to disclose an electronic collation means for presenting the stored image data for printing in the proper sequence, as often as is needed to produce the desired number of collated document sets, whereby a plurality of electronically collated, multi-page sets can be printed without re-rasterization. See Shope, column 3, lines 9 to 14.

However, Shope is believed to be silent on retrieving, from among a plurality of spooled logical pages, one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page by discriminating a logical page corresponding to numerical factors of the plurality of logical pages.

Winston is seen to disclose splitting a print job into a plurality of sets of pages, and delivering the plurality of sets of pages to a plurality of printers. More specifically, if a

print job is capable of being split, the print job is searched to find particular keys or markers, i.e., character strings that are associated with a page break and other characteristics important for printing properly (duplex printing (meaning on both sides of a sheet), collated printing, and “N-up” printing (number of pages printed on face of a sheet of paper)). See Winston, paragraph [0026].

However, Winston is believed to be silent on retrieving, from among a plurality of spooled logical pages, one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page by discriminating a logical page corresponding to numerical factors of the plurality of logical pages.

Roberts is seen to disclose comparing attributes of a print job indicated in a first file with attributes of a print job indicated in a second file to determine whether the attributes of the two print jobs are inconsistent. More specifically, Roberts is seen to disclose a document pre-processor 10 that may be used to determine whether information in a collation file, as shown in Roberts’ Figure 2, is correct in view of information specified in comments in a prolog section of a PostScript file 6 and output from a PostScript daemon 24. See Roberts, column 7, lines 21 to 26. The following example checking actions that Roberts’ document pre-processor 10 may perform with respect to the collation file, and responses, are listed at column 7, lines 31 to 45 of Roberts:

- “1. Compare pages indicated in collation file with pages printed as indicated in RIP messages 28. Indicate a discrepancy in the report.
2. Compare the sub-files of the collation file indicates are included with the included files indicated in the PostScript prolog comments. Indicate any discrepancies in the report.
3. Compare the fonts indicated in the collation file with the fonts used as indicated in the RIP messages 28. Indicate any discrepancies in the report.

4. Determine whether the PostScript file 6 includes any front and back covers indicated in the collation file. Indicate any discrepancies in the report”

On the other hand, the claims define discriminating a logical page corresponding to numerical factors of the plurality of logical pages to retrieve, from among a plurality of spooled logical pages, one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page.

In contrast, while Roberts is seen to disclose checking actions that may be performed with respect to a collation file, Roberts is believed to be silent on discriminating a logical page corresponding to numerical factors of a plurality of logical pages, much less performing the discrimination to retrieve, from among a plurality of spooled logical pages, one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page.

Therefore, Shope, Winston and Roberts, alone or in any permissible combination, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the notion of retrieving, from among a plurality of spooled logical pages, one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page by discriminating a logical page corresponding to numerical factors of the plurality of logical pages.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 19 and 20, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to recite subject matter that would not have been obvious from the applied art, and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due. However, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shant Tchakerian #61,825/

Shant H. Tchakerian

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No.: 61,825

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200